



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

of the monasteries, and certain Provençal forms of proper names in the poems betray this conspiracy.

The importance of M. Bédier's conclusions cannot be minimized. They affect the history of epic poetry in all ages. However they may be received, they will compel by the force and incisiveness of the arguments through which they are reached the adoption of a more practical method by other investigators, and one which will be more productive in lasting results. So far as the cycle of William is concerned, M. Bédier has destroyed the idea of a fusion of separate traditions in the legend of one glorious homonym. And at the same time he has disclosed the great source of its epic material in the stories of interested monasteries, fabricated for the use of minstrels. But the period for this partnership, which M. Bédier would set near the first Crusades, when the vagabond singers, filled with pious zeal, would come upon the relics of the great Christian chieftain and would learn of his deeds, seems too late by half a century or more. And, after all, how did the monks become aware of the value of their assets? Has M. Bédier positively proven that popular tradition, nay, even a folk-song, did not give them the hint?

F. M. WARREN.

The Dawn of the Constitution, or the Reigns of Henry III. and Edward I. (A. D. 1216-1307). By Sir JAMES H. RAMSAY, Bart., of Bamff, M.A., LL.D. (London: Swan Sonnenschein and Company; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1908. Pp. xxxii, 591.)

IN this work Sir James Ramsay continues his essentially narrative history of England through the reigns indicated. The interpretation of events is to be gathered, partly from direct statement, but mainly from the sequence of the action. This does not mean, however, that the author does not evince decided views as to interpretation or emphasis.

So far from giving the customary laudation to the political activity of the Franciscans in Henry's reign, Sir James plainly minimizes and even deprecates it. Although, of course, bound to mention their relations with Earl Simon, Bishop Grosseteste and the University of Oxford (pp. 51, 116, 136, note 2, 247), he lays equal stress on their utility to the king and pope, particularly in matters of finance (pp. 92, 115 ff.; cf. p. 213). The authorship of the *Carmen de Bello Lewensi* is definitely assigned to a non-Franciscan writer (p. 303, note 5).

Equally notable is the attitude of reserve adopted toward Simon de Montfort in general, and in particular toward his Gascon administration (pp. 132, 135; cf. pp. 246-247, *et passim*). Sir James, moreover, obviously thinks the "*Forte nominabitur recte leopardus*" of the *Song of Lewes* a better text for treating Edward than the "*Pactum Serva*" of the tomb at Westminster. Apparently the author would agree with Professor Jenks's view that Edward was probably waiting for Llewelyn

"to commit himself beyond forgiveness". Edward treated Llewelyn "with liberality", says he, "so far as money went, but it is not clear that in other respects he gave him a fair trial" (p. 335). The whole carefully written account of Scottish relations points to conscious duplicity on Edward's part. In particular are alleged the violation of the treaty of Brigham (pp. 381 ff.; cf. p. 380), the suppression of the protest of the Scottish *Communitas* (p. 384), the small part played by the Scottish arbiters among the One Hundred and Four (p. 394), the falsification of the records (pp. 385, 395, note 5) and the cancellation of the treaty of Brigham (p. 397). "Balliol was not a man of great parts, but he was no felon; he had behaved far more honourably to Edward than Edward had to him" (p. 427). The treatment of the Scottish question is one of the most valuable parts of the book, and a helpful supplement to other English histories.

That topical treatment which is so helpful in dealing with constitutional problems is obviously impossible in a strictly narrative account. One cannot but feel, in addition, that the author is somewhat inclined to read the present into the past. He follows Bishop Stubbs in seeing a not improbable origin of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility in the regency during Henry III.'s minority, and what amounts "in modern phrase to a demand for Ministerial responsibility to Parliament" is made by the twelve representatives of the prelates, earls and barons in 1244 (pp. 46, 108; cf. Charles Bémont, *Simon de Montfort*, p. 111, and G. B. Adams, *AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW*, XIII. 726, note 24). On the other hand we note with pleasure the very subordinate position (in a foot-note, p. 418, note 4) accorded the familiar *quod omnes tangit*, etc., of the clerical writs of 1295; and if Montfort's Parliament of 1265 is not discussed at length, its essentially opportunistic and temporary nature is indicated (p. 234). A hint only is accorded the process of the development of representation (p. 146), although a discussion of Riess's views of early Parliamentary rights and the working of borough-representation would have been welcome—as well indeed as of Professor Jenks's account of the Edwardian jurisprudence.

In matters of general accuracy and apparatus somewhat is left to be desired. The List of Authors Cited is not very scientifically worked out. Questions of edition and date are loosely cared for; we miss such familiar names as Bémont, Riess and Jenks; there is a tendency to cite older rather than more recent writers, Green and Martin for example rather than Sabatier and the Lavissee history—not that the statements are unreliable, but that the utility of the note to the student seeking the last word is sensibly diminished. Occasional use is made of the Lavissee history. The unity of the paragraph is not always preserved (*e. g.*, pp. 368–369), and sharp transitions in subject-matter are sometimes confusing (*e. g.*, pp. 28–30). There are obvious misprints and *lapsus calami* (pp. 4, note 5; 6, note 7; 383, 520). In note 2, p. 422, the reference to "Rot. Parl. IV, 427" might with

propriety have been altered to the original record, *Rot. Parl.*, I. 117. In note 2, p. 145, the reference should be to *Epp.*, no. 128, instead of to no. 123. "Similiter" is intrusive in page 418, note 4. The inference that Bek was a sorely abused man in the Quo Warranto proceedings (p. 422) is hardly consonant with the bishop's easy evasion of the issue and the fact that these proceedings, taken in connection with the trial of Archbishop Romanus shortly before, brought the Durham franchise to its highest point.

Sir James Ramsay has again done a great service, especially to students, who may at any time be helped by one or another apparently superfluous detail. Single minor incidents are made to contribute to the progress of the story; familiar dramatic events are sanely and soberly described (pp. 328, 409); the royal finance is treated with unique fullness and clearness; the military element is not preponderant. The historian has, within his limits of matter and form, provided "those desirous of knowing the cardinal facts of English history with a consecutive and verified narrative" (preface, p. v).

ROBERT K. RICHARDSON.

Marine World Chart of Nicolo de Canerio Januensis, 1502 (circa).

A Critical Study with Facsimile, by EDWARD LUTHER STEVENSON, Ph.D., Professor of History in Rutgers College. Issued under the joint auspices of the American Geographical Society and the Hispanic Society of America. (New York. 1908. Facsimile map, ten folio sheets; key-map, one folio sheet; octavo text; pp. 115.)

THIS is the second publication in a series of maps illustrating early discovery and exploration in America, issued under the joint auspices of the above societies, of which Mr. Archer M. Huntington is the head and patron. The initial publication, the world-map of Jodocus Hondius (1611), was noticed in the REVIEW (XIII. 179). The original map is a manuscript on coarse parchment, measuring 225 by 115 cm., inclusive of the border, and is well drawn and colored in green, blue, red and gold. It is one of the choicest treasures in the Archives du Service Hydrographique de la Marine, of Paris, and seems to have come originally to the French Department of State about the year 1669. For years it had lain neglected, hence is yellowed, much crinkled and the edges are badly frayed. Its antecedent history is unknown. Professor L. Gallois presented the first extended notice of it in 1890. Some years ago the French government had a few photographic copies printed, and outlines of facsimile reductions of sections have appeared in several works, by Gallois, Marcel, HARRISSE, RAVENSTEIN and others. But the present facsimile in the original size, dissected on ten large folio sheets, is its first publication in full for scholars and libraries, at the moderate price of twenty dollars. It required the ingenuity of